

Performative Constructions in Hausa*

by Philip J. Jaggar

ABSTRACT: Cross-linguistically, performative constructions are associated with a range of declarative direct speech acts with different illocutionary forces or meanings, e.g., promising, ordering, asserting, etc. In an utterance such as 'I promise to give the money back' the matrix verb 'promise' is used as a performative – it has the illocutionary force of a promise but pragmatically it also has an effect on the performance of the act it describes. Hausa performative verbs/constructions have been largely neglected in the literature, and in this paper I open up the subject by identifying: (1) the finite and nonfinite complement clauses and subordinators which are licensed by stereotypical performative verbs; (2) the TAM's (tense/aspect/mood) they typically occur with as matrix verbs, and the TAM's they govern in the embedded clause.

1. Preliminaries

One subtype of direct speech act which is attested in many languages involves the use of so-called "performative verbs" (on English performatives, see Austin 1962, Searle 1969, 1979, Bach & Harnish 1979, Quirk & al. 1985: 803–805, Allan 1986, 2006, Recanati 1987, and Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 858–61). Performative verbs (PV's) are a subclass of illocutionary verbs and are used cross-linguistically to explicitly mark the illocutionary force of a direct speech utterance, e.g., a statement, command, request, and also to effect the performance of the acts/events they specify. In other words, it is possible to do things simply by stating that we are doing them (Austin's "doing things with words"). Verbs which commonly function as PV's often express core modal dimensions such as necessity, permission, obligation and potentiality.

In terms of illocutionary meaning, speech act PV's group into the following major (sometimes overlapping) classes: (assertive) e.g., 'assert', (commissive) e.g., 'promise', (directive/mandative) e.g., 'order', (declarative) e.g., 'resign', and (expressive) e.g., 'apologize' (Searle 1979, Wierzbicka 1987). The English verb 'promise', for example, and its Hausa (phrasal) equivalent *yi àlkawàrii* 'promise' (lit. 'do/make

promise),¹ both convey the primary illocutionary force of a promise or commitment when used as lexical performatives, e.g.,

- (1) *naa yi àlkawàrīi zān zoo gòobe*
 1sg.pfv do promise fut.1sg come tomorrow
 'I promise I'll come tomorrow'

In (1) the PV assertion is a commitment to the complement event. Semantically, *yi àlkawàrīi* '(do/make) promise' belongs to the subclass of commissive verbs, and the overt (1sg) subject-argument of the embedded future clause corresponds to the matrix subject. Similarly, *gàř-gadāa* 'warn' has the broad illocutionary force of an assertive, as in:

- (2) *ināa gāřgāđīnkà dà kadà kà aikàtā wannān*
 1sg.impfv warning.of.2msg subord neg 2msg.sjctv do this
 'I am warning you/I warn you not to do this'

In (2) the overt (2msg) subject of the subordinate negative subjunctive clause corresponds to the matrix genitive object.

In these direct speech acts the speaker uses an explicit performative clause, spelled out in the lexical semantics of the non-factive reporting verbs, to make a promise (1) and assert a warning (2) respectively. The above two examples also illustrate the semantic/pragmatic distinction between (projected) self-actuated change as in 'I promise I'll come tomorrow', where the matrix and subordinate clause subjects are identical, and conferred personal change in 'I am warning you / I warn you not to do this' (lit. 'I am warning you you should not do this'), where the two subjects are different.

The above sentences serve to exemplify the defining (universal) characteristics of performative constructions as follows: (1) the matrix clause contains an explicit performative verb; (2) the PV usually has a first person singular subject (occasionally plural), and is often restricted in selection of tense-aspect; and (3) the PV occurs in a declarative (and normally affirmative) clause with direct force. This means that if we change the person or simple present tense in either of the above (English) direct speech sentences yielding, e.g., 'he promises he'll come tomorrow' [person change = indirect reported speech], 'I warned you not to do this' [tense change = indirect reported speech], then they do not qualify as performatives but are simply declarative reports/statements.

Performative constructions in Hausa have received virtually no attention in the linguistic literature,² perhaps because their use is limited, and my purpose in this paper is to explore two key questions which emerge from the above outline. Firstly, what types of complement clauses and subordinators do prototypical PV's select in Hausa? Secondly, what tense-aspect-moods do PV's occur with and what are the temporal interpretations of PV complements?³

2. Performative verbs in Hausa: core properties

We begin with a sample of Hausa verbs which are commonly used as performatives (there are more examples, including dialect variants):

<i>amincee dà</i> (gr4)*	'accept, agree' (neg. = 'deny, object to')
<i>baa dà izìni</i> (gr5)	'authorize' (lit. 'give permission')
<i>baa dà shaawaràa</i> (gr5)	'advise' (lit. 'give advice' = <i>shàawaràa</i> (gr2))
<i>bari</i> (gr2 irreg.)	'allow, leave'
<i>bùkaatàa</i> (gr2)	'require, need'
<i>càajaa</i> (gr2)	'charge' (legal)
<i>dàuki àlkawàri</i> (gr2)	'promise, vow' (lit. 'take promise')
<i>gàrgadàa</i> (gr2)	'warn'
<i>gayàa wà</i> (gr1)	'order' (lit. 'tell to')
<i>goodèe wà</i> (gr4)	'thank'
<i>hanàa</i> (gr1)	'forbid'
<i>kiraa</i> (gr0)	'summon'
<i>kàaliùubàlantàa</i> (gr2)	'challenge'
<i>ki</i> (gr0)	'refuse'
<i>kyaalèe</i> (gr4)	'allow, permit' (lit. 'ignore')
<i>nadàa</i> (gr1)	'appoint'
<i>rantsar</i> (<i>dà</i>) (gr5)	'swear in'
<i>ròokaa</i> (gr2)	'beg'
<i>shàidaa</i> (gr1)	'testify'
<i>sookèe</i> (gr4)	'rescind, cancel'
<i>sakii</i> = <i>sàkaa</i> (gr2)	'acquit, divorce' (lit. 'release')
<i>sàllamàa</i> (gr2)	'dismiss'
<i>tabbàtaa dà</i> (gr1)	'vouch for'
<i>tabbatar</i> (<i>dà</i>) (gr5)	'assert, bet'
<i>tàmbayàa</i> (gr2)	'ask'

<i>tunàa wà</i> (gr1)	'remind'
<i>tuuba</i> (<i>dà</i>) (gr3a)	'apologize (for)'
<i>ùmuřtāa</i> (gr2)	'order'
<i>yaafēe wà</i> (gr4)	'pardon'
<i>yankè(e) shaawarāa</i> (gr4)	'decide' (lit. 'cut decision')
<i>yārda</i> (gr3)	'agree, admit, accept' (neg. = 'deny, object to')
<i>yi àlkawàřii</i> (gr0)	'promise, vow' (lit. 'make promise')
<i>yi iimaanii = yi àmaanāa</i> (gr0)	'testify' (lit. 'do faith/belief')
<i>yi rantsuwaa</i> (gr0)	'swear (oath)' (lit. 'do swearing')
<i>yi wà X afuwāa</i> (gr0)	'pardon X' (lit. 'do for X pardon')
<i>yankèe wà X hukuncii</i> (gr4)	'sentence X' (lit. 'cut for X sentence')
<i>zàaḅaa</i> (gr2)	'elect, choose'

*gr = grade of the verb (including head verb in complex [verb + noun] forms)

The (near) synonymous 'promise' verbs *yi àlkawàřii* (lit. 'do/make promise') and *dāuki àlkawàřii* (lit. 'take promise') consist respectively of the light verbs *yi* 'do/make' and *dāuki* 'take' (pre-NP form) plus the complement noun *àlkawàřii* 'promise' (cf. Eng. 'make a promise'). Note too the light use of *baa dà* 'give (away)' in *baa dà shaawarāa* 'advise (give advice)'.

Verbs which can function as performatives occur with a range of complement structures (§ 3), and differ prototypically in their basic syntactic subcategorization as follows:

Monotransitive (+ DO):	<i>sàllamāa</i>	'dismiss'
Ditransitive (+ indirect + DO):	<i>gayāa wà</i>	'tell to, order'
Complex transitive (+ DO + complement):	<i>ùmuřtāa</i>	'order'
Intransitive (no object):	<i>yārda</i>	'agree'

Some verbs can license more than one pattern of complementation, e.g., *tuuba* is functioning as an intransitive-performative in *naa tuuba* 'I repent/apologize' (1SG.PFV apologize), but selects a prepositional complement in *naa tuuba dà shān giyāa* 'I give up drinking' (1SG.PFV repent with drinking.of beer), where the PP complement *shān giyāa* 'drinking of beer' is headed by the preposition *dà* 'with'.

Some illocutionary verbs are restricted to use with a perfective TAM in direct speech performative constructions, often corresponding to an English simple present (permissible in English because the performative utterance and illocutionary act are often coterminous). The respective TAM's also share the property of expressing timeless generic events, stage directions and headlines (Jaggar 2006: 110ff.).

Examples of such performatives, some of them inherently stative/stative verbs,⁴ with first person singular perfective TAM's, are:

- (3) *naa yankèè makà hukuncin daurìn shèekaràa ukkù*
 1sg.pfv cut 2msg.i.o. sentence.of imprisonment.of year three
 'I sentence you to three years imprisonment' (lit. 'I cut for you ...')
- (4) *naa kì kì jee jaami'aa*
 1sg.pfv refuse 2fsg.sjntv go university
 'I refuse (to allow) you to go to university'

A possible test of whether or not a particular utterance is a performative is to judge if one can legitimately insert a deictic adverbial phrase such as *dàgà yâu* (lit. 'from today') or *dàgà yànzù* (lit. 'from now'), roughly equivalent to the English adverb 'hereby' (this diagnostic doesn't hold universally however). Sentences (5–6) contain the adverbs *dàgà yànzù* and *dàgà yâu* in preverbal position and the resulting (performative) expressions are coherent:

- (5) *dàgà yànzù naa barìi*
 from now 1sg.pfv leave/allow
 'I hereby resign'
- (6) *dàgà yâu naa sàkee kì*
 from today 1sg.pfv release 2fsg
 'I hereby divorce you'

Depending upon the pragmatic context, a perfective TAM with a matrix stative verb can have a default present-time (performative) or past-time (non-performative) interpretation, e.g.,

- (7) *naa yaŋjèè/amìncee miki kì jee*
 1sg.pfv agree 2fsg.i.o. 2fsg.sjntv go
 'I agree for you to go' (= present-time performative) OR:
 'I agreed for you to go' (= past-time non-performative statement)
- (8) *naa shâidaa cêewaa sun fàdì gàskiyaa*
 1sg.pfv testify subord 3pl.pfv tell truth
 'I testify that they have told the truth' (= present-time performative) or:
 'I testified that they had told the truth' (= past-time non-performative)

(See § 4 below for the use of subordinating complementizers.)

Some directive PV's, mainly associated with dynamic situations, can take an imperfective TAM (often in preference to the perfective). Note that the present progressive in English can also be used with (most of) the same PV's, and is included in the (9–13) glosses as equivalent to the Hausa imperfective:

- (9) *inàa ròòkonkà kà dainà hakà*
 1sg.impfv begging.of.2msg 2msg.sjctv stop that
 'I am begging/I beg you to stop that'
- (10) *inàa baa kà shaawaĩr kà kyaalèe ta*
 1sg.impfv give 2msg advice.of 2msg.sjctv ignore 3fsg
 'I am advising/I advise you to ignore her'
- (11) *munàa gārgādīnkà kār kà aikàtā wannān*
 1pl.impfv warning.of.2msg neg 2msg.sjctv do this
 'we are warning/we warn you not to do this'
- (12) *inàa maa àlkawāĩi bàa zān saakè yī ba*
 1sg.impfv 2msg.i.o. promise neg fut.1sg repeat doing neg
 'I am promising/I promise you I won't do (that) again'
- (13) *inàa makà rantsuwaa zān yi wānnan*
 1sg.impfv 2msg.i.o. swearing fut.1sg do that
 'I swear to you that I'll do that'

PV's can also occur with non-referential 4th person plural subjects, where the construction corresponds to an agentless passive in English, e.g.,

- (14) *an cii kà tàaraĩ Nairāa dubuu* (with NP complement)
 4pl.pfv eat 2msg fine.of Naira 1,000
 'you are fined one 1,000 Naira' (lit. 'one has fined you 1,000 N.')
- (15) *an hanà mù shaa taabàa à nān*
 4pl.pfv forbid 1pl.sjctv smoke tobacco at here
 'we are forbidden to smoke here'
- (16) *an baa nì izīnii ìn gīnà gidāa nān*
 4pl.pfv give 1sg permission 1sg.sjctv build house here
 'I am authorized to build a house here'

- (17) *an zàabee kà kà wàkĩlcee mù*
 4pl.pfv elect 2msg 2msg.sjctv represent 1pl
 'you are elected to represent us'

- (18) *anàa kirànkà*
 4pl.impfv summoning.of.2msg
 'you're being summoned'

Example (19) illustrates an active intransitive construction with same-subject control (see § 3.2):

- (19) *an k̃i à zoo*
 4pl.pfv refuse 4pl.sjctv come
 'we refuse to come' (lit. 'one refuses one should come')

Inherently negative notions such as 'deny', 'object to' etc. are commonly expressed by syntactically negative PV's, e.g.,

- (20) *bàn amĩncee dà zàrgĩn dà ka yi ba*
 neg.1sg.pfv agree with accusation.the subord 2msg.foc-pfv do neg
 'I deny the accusation you have made' (lit. 'I don't agree with ...')
- (21) *bàn yàřda dà shaawařàřkà ba*
 neg.1sg.pfv agree with proposal.of.2msg neg
 'I object to your proposal' (lit. 'I don't agree with ...')

3. Complementation

The paradigmatic type of complement structure for performative verbs is a finite clause headed by a verb with a non-factive subjunctive TAM (sometimes with an overt VP subordinator). Exceptions to this normative pattern involve complements containing: (a) subordinate future TAM clauses; (b) nonfinite clauses and NP complements; (c) factive PV's controlling a wider range of subordinate clause TAM's.

3.1. Performative verbs with finite subjunctive TAM complements

Verbs which can be used as prototypical (mandative) performatives normally license finite clause complements containing a verb

with an inflectional subjunctive TAM (see Jaggar (1982) for an account of grammatically distinct imperatives used to issue directives). The Hausa subjunctive is similar to tensed finite forms in that it can be used in an independent main clause and its subject is overtly marked on an obligatory independent preverbal word (INFL) composed of a subject-agreement element and an auxiliary TAM-marker (subjunctive clauses also use the same subordinator, see § 4). These finite subjunctive clauses function as internal complements to modal PV's, and are equivalent to embedded *to*-infinitives in English, denoting a non-factive event/situation which is temporally posterior to the matrix clause time (see § 5 for the temporal interpretations of PV constructions). Semantically, many of these constructions represent a subcase of deontic modality, and the PV's belong to the category of verbs of influence, i.e., they denote attempts to influence or modify behaviour (Quirk et al. 1985: 1180 refer to them as "suasive verbs" which "imply intentions to bring about some change in the future"). In terms of their syntax, many of these modal verbs license an object as part of their complementation before the subordinate clause, and examples (22–28) – taken from a variety of sources and personal fieldnotes – illustrate typical performative constructions with a mandative subjunctive complement and an intervening object. If the matrix PV takes an imperfective TAM and converts to a "strong" verbal noun, then the optional (but preferred) thematic object is formally realized as a genitive pronoun clitic following the genitive linker. This (object) argument is in turn the subject of the lower clause. Examples are:

PV + object + subjunctive clause

- (22) *inàa kàalùubàlantařsà* [*yà nuunàa minì shaidàřsà*]
 1sg.impfv challenging.of.3msg 3msg.sjctv show 1sg.i.o. evidence.of.3msg
 'I challenge him to show me his evidence'
- (23) *naa bùkàacee kà* [*kà hàlàřci tàarôn*]
 1sg.pfv require 2msg 2msg.sjctv attend meeting.the
 'I require you to attend the meeting'
- (24) *mun gàrgàdee kà* [*kà yi à hankàlìi*]
 1pl.pfv warn 2msg 2msg.sjctv do in care
 'we warn you to be careful'

- (25) *inàa baa kà shaawārār [kà biyaa hàraajìn]*
 1sg.impfv give 2msg advice.of 2msg.sjntv pay tax.the
 'I'm advising you to pay the tax'
- (26) *naa gayàa makà [kà barii]*
 1sg.pfv order/tell 2msg.i.o. 2msg.sjntv stop
 'I order you to stop'
- (27) *naa yaŕjèe mikì [kì jee]*
 1sg.pfv agree 2fsg.i.o. 2fsg.sjntv go
 'I agree for you to go'

Example (28) has a subjunctive complement introduced by the negative subordinator *kâr*:

- (28) *inàa ròokonkà [kâr kà toonà àsiirii]*
 1sg.impfv begging.of.2msg neg subord 2msg.sjntv dig up secret
 'I'm begging you not to reveal the secret'

Some permissive PV's subcategorize for an optional (in)direct object before the embedded subjunctive clause, e.g. (with raising-to-object in the (a) versions),

PV (+ object) + subjunctive clause

- (29)a. *naa amìncee [wà Hàliimà] [tà jee]*
 1sg.pfv agree iom Halima 3fsg.sjntv go
- = b. *naa amìncee [Hàliimà tà jee]*
 1sg.pfv agree Halima 3fsg.sjntv go
 'I agree Halima should go'
- (30)a. *naa baŕ [kù] [kù ci gàba]*
 1sg.pfv allow 2pl 2pl.sjntv carry on
- = b. *naa barii [kù ci gàba]*
 1sg.pfv allow 2pl.sjntv carry on
 'I allow you to carry on'

Other PV's require a simple finite subjunctive complement, e.g. (ex. 4 repeated),

PV + subjunctive clause (see also § 3.2 below)

- (31) *naa ki [kì jee jaami'aa]*
 1sg.pfv refuse 2fsg.sjctv go university
 'I refuse (to allow) you to go to university'

3.2. Exceptions to the subjunctive complement pattern

There are exceptions to the canonical finite subjunctive construction. Some lexical modal PV's, both mandative/influence and commissive, also license a complement consisting of a subjectless nonfinite clause (32b), and the two constructions appear to be basically interchangeable.⁵ Both the matrix and nonfinite embedded clauses have same-subject control, and the missing subject is recoverable from the superordinate clause which controls the gap, e.g.,

- (32)a. *mun ki [mù yi wannàn aikii]*_{subjunctive}
 1pl.pfv refuse 1pl.sjctv do this work
 'we refuse to do this work' (lit. 'we refuse we should do this work')
- = b. *mun_i ki [___i yin wannàn aikii]*_{verbal noun}
 1pl.pfv refuse doing.of this work
 'we refuse to do this work' (lit. 'we refuse doing this work')

In (32b), the nonfinite complement [*yin wannàn aikii*] consists of the head verbo-nominal form *yin* 'doing of' with the complement *wannàn aikii* 'this work'.

When an NP object intervenes between the matrix and subordinate verbs, the construction has control by object. Covertly negative verbs such as *hanàa* 'forbid, prevent', for example, subcategorize for both: (a) a finite subjunctive (33a), and (b) a nonfinite complement where the controller of the missing subject is the matrix object (33b).⁶

- (33)a. *naa hanàa shi [yà shaa taabàa] à nân*
 1sg.pfv forbid 3msg 3msg.sjctv smoke tobacco at here
 'I forbid him to smoke here'
- = b. *naa hanàa shi_i [___i shân taabàa] à nân*
 1sg.pfv forbid 3msg smoking.of tobacco at here
 'I forbid him to smoke here'

The matrix performative verb '(make a) promise' normally requires a complement with a future TAM, which is semantically non-factive like the subjunctive, and the overt subject of both tensed clauses must be identical, e.g.,

- (34)a. *naa yi àlkawàrì(n) [zân duubà aikinkà] cikin hanzarii*
 1sg.pfv do promise(of) fut.1sg look at work.of.2msg in speed
 'I promise I will look at your work quickly'

Notice in (34a) that the phrase-final noun in complex [verb + noun] verbs can optionally suffix the genitive linker 'of' (here masc. /-n/), and the subordinate clause is actually the complement of the head noun *àlkawàrì(n)* 'promise (of)' (I have transcribed these examples as they were recorded in my fieldnotes). In the corresponding nonfinite version the linker is required:

- (35)b. *naa yi àlkawàrìn [duubà aikinkà] cikin hanzarii*
 1sg.pfv do promise.of look at work.of.2msg in speed
 'I promise to look at your work quickly'

Some PV's take a (human) NP complement (referred to as a "small clause" in formal syntactic theory). These expressions are typically "transformative", implying the simultaneous actualization of the complement event (§ 5), e.g.,

- (36) *naa nadà wannàn mùtumìn à matsayin ciyàamân*
 1sg.pfv appoint this man.the in position.of chairman
 'I appoint this man to the position of chairman'
- (37) *an zàaḃee kà sakataṛèe*
 4pl.pfv elect 2msg secretary
 'you are elected secretary'
- (38) *an rantsaṛ dà Muusaa à matsayin wàkiilinnù*
 4pl.pfv swear in Musa in position.of representative.of.1pl
 'Musa is sworn in as our representative'

Cf. too ditransitive (ex. 14 repeated):

- (39) *an cii kà tàaraĩ Naiřàa dubuu*
 4pl.pfv eat 2msg fine.of Naira 1,000
 'you are fined one 1,000 Naira' (lit. 'one has fined you 1,000 N.')

Depending upon the semantics of the governing performative verb and the pragmatic context, the subordinate clause can contain a past-time perfective TAM (see also § 5). In (40–42) the assertive PV's are interpreted as factives, presupposing the truth of the propositions in the embedded clauses which take perfective TAM's (= focus perfective in (40) following the *dà* VP subordinator):

- (40) *naa goodèe makà dà [ka tàimàkee nì]*
 1sg.pfv thank 2msg.i.o. subord 2msg.foc-pfv help 1sg
 'I thank you for helping me' (lit. '...that you helped me')
- (41) *naa yi iimaanìn cêewaa [sun fàdì gàskiyaa]*
 1sg.pfv do faith.of subord 3pl.pfv tell truth
 'I testify they have told the truth'
- (42) *inàa tabbataĩ makà [Muusaa yaa ci jaĩr̀àb̀aaẁaĩ]*
 1sg.pfv assure 2msg.i.o. Musa 3msg.pfv pass exam.the
 'I assure you Musa has passed the exam'

4. Performative verbs with subordinating complementizers *cêewaa* and *dà*

Most verbs which can function as performatives optionally select a complementizer to overtly mark the embedded clause as subordinate. The complementizer is either *cêewaa* 'that' as in (41) (lit. 'saying', the verbo-nominal form of the communicative verb *cêe*), or *dà* 'that' as in (40) (*dà* also introduces subordinate relative clauses which share syntax with fronted focus/*wh*-elements, hence the obligatory occurrence of the special focus form of the TAM in (40) and elsewhere). The two markers can also combine as *dà cêewaa*.

The choice of subordinator does not seem to be semantically conditioned, i.e., it is lexically specific in most cases, though there is a preference for *dà* with subjunctive complements (*dà* can also function as a nonfinite clause subordinator, § 3). Considerable speaker varia-

tion complicates these marking options, however, and the factors favouring retention or omission of the subordinator, e.g., formal/informal style, dialect, structure of the matrix and/or subordinate clause, etc., remain poorly understood (cf. Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 953–54 for comments on the complex factors governing optional omission of ‘that’ in English). Below I provide a few examples of the more common PV’s with mainly optional subordinators, most of them either adapted from other sources or recorded in my own fieldnotes. See also Tuller (1986), Bagari (1987: 118ff.), Dimmendaal (1989), Yalwa (1995: chap. 3), Newman (2000: 97ff.) and Jaggar (2001: 560ff.).

With most PV’s, the presence of a subordinator seems to be the default option (though omission is possible for some speakers and is indicated with parentheses), e.g.,

- (43) *inàa ùmuṛtārkà [(dà) kà koomàa gidaa]*
 1sg.impfv ordering.of.2msg (subord) 2msg.sjctv return home
 ‘I order you to return home’
- (44) *inàa ròokonkà [(dà) kà koomàa gidaa]*
 1sg.impfv begging.of.2msg (subord) 2msg.sjctv return home
 ‘I am begging you to return home’
- (45) *inàa baa kà shaawaṛàa [(cêewaa) kà biyaa hàṛaajìn]*
 1sg.impfv give 2msg advice (subord) 2msg.sjctv pay tax.the
 ‘I’m advising you to pay the tax’
- (46) *naa yàṛda [(cêewaa) naa yi kuskurèe]*
 1sg.pfv agree (subord) 1sg.pfv do mistake
 ‘I admit (that) I’ve made a mistake’
- (47) *inàa tabbataṛ mukù [(cêewaa) zaa à yi ruwaa yâu]*
 1sg.impfv assure 2pl.i.o. (subord) fut 4pl do rain today
 ‘I bet you (that) it will rain today’
- (48) *inàa rantsuwaa [(cêewaa) zân yi wànnan]*
 1sg.impfv swearing (subord) fut.1sg do that
 ‘I swear to you (that) I’ll do that’
- (49) *inàa tunàa mukù [(cêewaa) zaa mù taashì dà kàrfèe ukkù]*
 1sg.impfv remind 2pl.i.o. (subord) fut 1pl leave at o’clock three
 ‘I am reminding you (that) we will leave at 3 o’clock’

- (50) *naa yi àlkawàrin [(cêewaa) bàa zân saakè yî ba]*

1sg.pfv do promise.of (subord) neg fut.1sg. do again doing neg

'I promise (that) I won't do (that) again'

Negative subjunctive mandates with the negative subordinator *kâř* can also be optionally introduced by *dà*, e.g.,

- (51) *munàa gàřgàdìnkà [(dà) kâř kà yi hakà]*

1pl.impfv warning.of.2msg (subord) neg 2msg.sjctv do this

'we are warning you not to do this' (lit. 'we warn you (that) you should not do this')

With the verb *goodèe* 'thank', however, the *dà* subordinator cannot be omitted without loss of grammaticality, e.g.,

- (52) *wàllaahì naa goodèe makà [dà ka tàimàkee nì]*

honestly 1sg.pfv thank 2msg.i.o. subord 2msg.foc-pfv help 1sg

'honestly I thank you for helping me' (lit. '... that you helped me')

5. Temporal interpretations of PV complements

There is a close association between the modal (necessity, possibility, etc.) and temporal dimensions of performatives, and the different temporal interpretations of modal performative complements are in general conditioned by the semantic properties of the PV in the higher clause. Basically, the complements can be classified according to whether the time-point referred to is (a) posterior to, (b) anterior to, or (c) simultaneous with, the time specified in the matrix clause. Directive ('order' etc.) and commissive ('promise' etc.) PV's governing a subjunctive or future complement correlate (predictably) with a posterior-to-matrix interpretation [future projection] for the complement clause, e.g.,

[posterior-to-matrix]

- (53) *munàa gàřgàdìnkà [kâř kà aikàtà wannàn]*

1pl.impfv warning.of.2msg. neg 2msg.sjctv do this

'we are urging/warning you [not to do this]'

- (54) *naa yi àlkawàřii [zân kiraawoo Muusaa gòobe]*

1sg.pfv do promise fut.1sg call Musa tomorrow

'I promise [I'll call Musa tomorrow]'

- (55) *inàa ròòkonkà [kà gòoyi baayan gwamnati]*
 1sg.impfv begging.of.2msg 2msg.sjctv support back.of government
 'I am begging you [to support the government]'

In (55), the time of the bracketed [you supporting the government] subjunctive clause is interpreted as posterior to the time of the [my begging] matrix clause PV. As already noted (§ 3), in such contexts, the subjunctive expresses the non-factuality of the future complement situation. Contrast this with (56), where the time of the embedded finite clause [my doing wrong] is anterior to the time of matrix [my admitting], and the complement of the governing factive verb *yàrda* 'admit' denotes prior actualization of the event:

[anterior-to-matrix]

- (56) *naa yàrda [naa yi lâifii]*
 1sg.pfv admit 1sg.pfv do wrong
 'I admit [I did wrong]'

In (57), the time of the matrix [forbidding] and embedded non-finite [smoking] clauses are conceptualized as simultaneous:

[simultaneous-to-matrix]

- (57) *an hanà [shân taabàa nân]*
 4pl.pfv forbid smoking.of tobacco here
 '[smoking] is forbidden here'

Finally, in (58–59) the speech act and the self-actuated change are also simultaneous:

- (58) *naa tuuba*
 1sg.pfv apologize
 'I apologize'
- (59) *naa sàki aikii!*
 1sg.pfv release work
 'I resign!'

6. Summary

In this paper I have examined a category of illocutionary verbs which has received little attention in the literature – verbs which are used as explicit performatives in syntactically declarative clauses associated with pragmatically different types of illocutionary force, and which effect the performance of the acts they denote. I considered some of the more common performative verbs in Hausa, looking at their functional distribution in terms of the TAM's they occur with, the finite and nonfinite complementation patterns they govern, and the presence or absence of a subordinator.

Notes

* I wish to thank Isa Abba Adamu, Mustapha Ahmad, Melanie Green, Mustapha Gwadabe, Jamilah Tangaza, and especially Malami Buba and Mohammed Lawal Aminu, for their helpful insights, comments and corrections. Any errors of fact or interpretation are entirely mine.

¹ Transcription: $\grave{a}(a)$ = Low tone, $\hat{a}(a)$ = Falling tone (on heavy CVV or CVC syllable), High tone is unmarked; *aa, ii*, etc. = long, *a, i*, etc. = short; β , d' = laryngeal implosives, k , ts = ejectives, 'y = glottalized palatal glide, \tilde{r} = apical tap/roll, *c* and *j* = palato-alveolar affricates. Abbreviations: F = feminine; FOC-IMPFV = focus (relative) imperfective; FOC-PFV = focus (relative) perfective; FUT = future; IMPFV = (general) imperfective; i.o. = indirect object; i.o.m. = indirect object marker; M = masculine; NEG = negative; PFV = (general) perfective; PL = plural; SG = singular; SJNCTV = subjunctive; SUBORD = subordinator; 1/2/3/4 = first/second/third/fourth person.

² There are two marginal exceptions. Schuh & Gimba (2001) describe performative expressions in the closely-related language Bole and touch upon the phenomenon in Hausa. For Hausa specifically, Parsons (1981: 400ff.) classifies and exemplifies a number of verbs which commonly function as PV's as "verbs of declaration/ supposition/belief", and Bagari (1987: 113ff.) covers the use of subordination with typical PV's.

³ In speech acts theory, certain conditions/conventions enable speech acts to be felicitously performed, e.g., if I make a promise to you I should be able to fulfil it, but such felicity conditions will not concern us here. (See Allan 2006.)

⁴ Performatives and statives in the related languages Bole and Miya occur with the perfective (Schuh 1998: 154, Schuh & Gimba 2001: 101). In Hausa, the correlation between stativity and TAM selection is partly a lexical property – semantically stative verbs such as *fi* ‘exceed’, *ki* ‘refuse’, *sanɪ* ‘know’, etc. take a perfective, but stative *soo* ‘want’ usually occurs with the imperfective (despite its strong stative meaning).

⁵ Some speakers appear to have a preference for the subjunctive construction when the matrix time is the actual moment of speaking (the deictic present), i.e., (32a) *mun ki [mù yi wannàn aikii]*_{subjunctive} ‘we refuse to do this work’ (lit. ‘we refuse we do this work’) is preferred over (32b) *mun ki [yîn wannàn aikii]*_{verbal noun} ‘we refuse to do this work’ (lit. ‘we refuse doing this work’). I am unsure how widespread this possible correlation is, whether it is dialectal, formal/informal style, or is perhaps motivated by the semantics of the two complement types, e.g., subjunctive constructions typically express the non-factuality of the complement situation cross-linguistically, whereas verbo-nominal forms tend to express real-world actualities.

⁶ Parsons (1981: 480ff.) analyzes permissive verbs like *barɪ* ‘allow, permit’, *yàɗɗa* ‘agree’ etc. as “catenatives” in environments containing chains of verbs which “almost always occur in the same tense system”, i.e., in finite tensed clauses with subject-agreement on the inflectional element (see also Furniss 1991: 115–117). This wide-ranging characterization deviates, however, from the conventional definition of catenative (verb) constructions as potentially recursive chains of verbs taking subjectless nonfinite complements, e.g., ‘he seems [to manage to offend just about everyone]’ (see also Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 1176ff.). *Hanàa* ‘stop, prevent, forbid’, however, does belong to the class of lexical verbs in Hausa which can participate in recursive catenative constructions in the accepted sense, e.g., *an hanà [shân taabàa] dà [cîn àbinci] à nân* ‘smoking and eating (food) are forbidden here’ (4pl.pfv forbid drinking of tobacco and eating of food at here).

References

- Allan, Keith, 1986: *Linguistic Meaning* (vols 1–2). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
 –, 2006: Performative clauses. In: *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 2nd ed., ed. by Keith Brown, vol. 9. Oxford: Elsevier, 283–287.
 Austin, J. L., 1962: *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Bach, Kent & Robert M. Harnish, 1979: *Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bagari, Dauda M., 1976: *Subordinate Adverbial Clauses in Hausa*. University of California at Los Angeles, Ph.D. dissertation.
- , 1987: *Hausa Subordinate Adverbial Clauses: Syntax and Semantics*. Rabat [Morocco]: El Maarif Al Jadida.
- Dimmendaal, Gerrit J., 1989: Complementizers in Hausa. In: *Current Progress in Chadic Linguistics*, ed. by Zygmunt Frajzyngier. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 87–110.
- Furniss, Graham, 1991: *Second Level Hausa: Grammar in Action*. London: SOAS, University of London.
- Huddleston, Rodney & Geoffrey K. Pullum, 2002: *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jaggar, Philip J., 1982: Monoverbal imperative formation in Hausa: a striking case of analogical realignment. In: *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 4: 133–156.
- , 2001: *Hausa*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- , 2006: The Hausa perfective tense-aspect used in *wh*-focus constructions and historical narratives: a unified account. In: *West African Linguistics: Papers in Honor of Russell G. Schuh*, ed. by Paul Newman & Larry M. Hyman. In: *Studies in African Linguistics*, Supplement 11: 100–133.
- Newman, Paul, 2000: *The Hausa Language: An Encyclopedic Reference Grammar*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Parsons, F. W., 1981: *Writings on Hausa Grammar: The Collected Papers of F. W. Parsons*, ed. by G. L. Furniss. Ann Arbor: UMI Books on Demand.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech & Jan Svartvik, 1985: *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Recanati, François, 1987: *Meaning and Force: the Pragmatics of Performative Utterances*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schuh, Russell G., 1998: *A Grammar of Miya*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- , & Alhaji Maina Gimba, 2001: Substantive and anaphoric ‘thing’ in Bole, with remarks on Hausa *abu/abin*. In: *UCLA Working Papers in Linguistics*, 6. *Papers in African Linguistics* 1, ed. by Harold Torrence; 91–133.
- Searle, John R., 1969: *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- , 1979: *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tuller, Laurice A., 1986: *Bijjective Relations in Universal Grammar and the Syntax of Hausa*. University of California at Los Angeles, Ph.D. dissertation.
- Wierzbicka, Anna, 1987: *English Speech Act Verbs: A Semantic Dictionary*. Sydney: Academic Press.
- Yalwa, Lawan Danladi, 1995: *Issues in Hausa Complementation*. University of California at Los Angeles, Ph.D. dissertation.